UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCY
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/975,587 | 10/11/2001 | Dean Bernard Jacobs | BEAS-01077US3 | 8688 |
| 23910 7590 02/19/2008 FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | BATURAY, ALICIA | |
| 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108 | | · | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | • | | 2155 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | - | 02/19/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Interview Summary | 09/975,587 | JACOBS ET AL. | | |
| interview Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | ALICIA BATURAY | 2155 | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTC | O personnel): | | | |
| (1) <u>ALICIA BATURAY (USPTO)</u> . | (3) | | | |
| (2) <u>Joseph P. O'Malley (Reg. #36,226)</u> . | (4) | · | | |
| Date of Interview: 11 February 2008. | | | | |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant | 2) applicant's representative | e] | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: | e)⊠ No. | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: Independent claims 1,36,40,41 and 4 | 4 <u>6-51</u> . | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: Britton et al. (U.S. 5,613,060). | | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. | g)□ was not reached. h)⊠ t | N/A. | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Shee</u> (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amerallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no | <u>t.</u> ndments which the examiner ag | greed would render the claims | | |
| allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attach | | | | |
| THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS IN FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INT requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | ne last Office action has already R OF ONE MONTH OR THIRT ITERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, | been filed, APPLICANT IS Y DAYS FROM THIS WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO | | |
| SUPERVIO | ALEMNAJJAP PRY PATENT EXAMINER | | | |
| | · | | | |
| | /Alicia Baturay/ Examiner, Art Unit 2155 | | | |
| Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. | Examiner's signature, if requ | ired | | |
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03) Intervie | ew Summary | Paper No. 20080211 | | |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant initiated interview to clarify operation of the invention and advance prosecution. Applicant cited the Britton reference, col. 31, lines 36-38,"Since there can be only zero or one resources in update mode in the entire synchronization point," and believed it to read that only zero or one server could be updated concurrently, whereas the claims were previously amended to include two or more servers. The examiner stated that she would carefully reconsider the reference and conduct a further search if necessary.